

Appl. No. 10/771,689

Amdt. Dated September 14, 2005

Reply to Office Action of August 11, 2005

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office action mailed August 11, 2005. Reexamination and reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Claims 1, 3-17 and 19-31 are now pending in this application, with Claims 1, 14, 17, and 28 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 6-15, 17, 19 and 20 have been rejected. Claims 2-5 and 16 have been objected to. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the features of Claim 2. Claim 2 has been cancelled. Claims 4 and 5 have been amended to correct typographical errors. Claim 11 has been amended in light of the amendment to Claim 1. Claims 14-16 have been amended to further clarify the invention. Claim 17 has been amended to incorporate the features of Claim 18. Claim 18 has been cancelled. Claims 20-31 have been allowed. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the allowance of Claims 20-31. No new matter is believed to have been added.

REJECTION UNDER 35. U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner states that the limitation "surfaces of the slot of the curved slot portion is fabricated with a thinner recast layer than other surfaces of the slot" is unclear. The Examiner states, more specifically that it is unclear which surfaces Applicant is referring to.

In response, Applicant has amended Claim 15 to claim a J-shaped slot that is formed by an electric discharge wire machine, which leaves a recast layer along all surfaces of the J-shaped slot, wherein the top surface and the bottom surface of the

Appl. No. 10/771,689

Amtd. Dated September 14, 2005

Reply to Office Action of August 11, 2005

curved slot portion are fabricated with a thinner recast layer than an inner surface of the linear slot portion.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35. U.S.C. § 102

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,850,895 (Evrard). This rejection is respectfully traversed, at least in light of the above claim amendments.

Independent Claim 14 now recites a J-shaped slot. Evrard fails to teach the inclusion of a J-shaped slot. Claims 15 and 16 have been amended in light of the amendment to Claim 14. As such, the anticipation rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 have been obviated, and withdrawal of the same is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35. U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 6-14, 17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4, 536,932 (Athey) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,071,313 (Nichols).

These rejections are respectfully traversed, at least in light of the above claim amendments. Although the Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's allegation of obviousness, for the purposes of expediting the prosecution of this application, the Applicant has amended Claim 1 to incorporate the features of Claim 2. The Examiner indicated that Claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all

Appl. No. 10/771,689

Amdt. Dated September 14, 2005

Reply to Office Action of August 11, 2005

of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Newly amended Claim 1 now recites the features of Claim 2 and its base claim, and thus should be in a condition for allowance.

The dependent claims 6-13 are also submitted to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to independent Claim 1, and because each recites features which are patentable in its own right.

Applicant has amended Claim 14 to include the J-shaped slot limitation as previously detailed.

Applicant has amended Claim 17 to incorporate the features of Claim 18. The Examiner indicated that Claim 18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Newly amended Claim 17 now recites the features of Claim 18 and its base claim, and thus should be allowed.

The dependent Claim 19 is also submitted to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to independent Claim 17, and because it recites features which are patentable in its own right.

Therefore, based on the above-presented arguments, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Conclusion

Based on the above, independent Claims 1, 14, and 17 are patentable over the citations of record. The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to the independent claims and because each recite

Appl. No. 10/771,689

Amdt. Dated September 14, 2005

Reply to Office Action of August 11, 2005

features which are patentable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

Hence, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated:

September 14, 2005

By:

K. Brooke Coleman
K. Brooke Coleman
Reg. No. 37,598
(480) 385-5060